ЗМ

JAN 1 2 2006

RECEIVED **CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL FORM	Application Number	10/727026
	Filing Date	December 2, 2003
	First Named Inventor	Ouderkirk, Andrew J.
	Art Unit	2879
	Examiner Name	Quarterman, Kevin J.
Fax: 571-273-8300	Attorney Docket Number	59417US002
Total Number of Pages in Th	is Submission: 3	
Date: January 12, 2006	Attorney for Applicant: Stephen C. Jensen	
E	NCLOSURES (check all 밥	nat apply)

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)			
Fee Transmittal Form Issue Fee Transmittal Amendment Transmittal	☐ Petition	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences	
Amendment/Reply After Final Affidavits/Declaration(s)	Petition to Convert a Provisional Application	Appeal Communication to Technology Center (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)	
☐ Extension of Time Request	☐ Power of Attorney, Revocation	Proprietary Information	
Express Abandonment Request	☐ Change of Correspondence Address	☐ Status Letter	
Information Disclosure Statement	☐ Terminal Disclaimer	Other Enclosures: Response to Restriction Requirement	
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR § 1.52 or 1.53 Response to Missing Parts under 35 USC 371 in US Designated/ Elected Office (DO/EO/US)	Request for Refund		
☐ Drawings	After Allowance Communication to Technology Center		
REMARKS:			

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL OR LEGALLY PRIVILEGED INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE PERSON OR ENTITY NAMED BELOW.

If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, use, disclose, distribute or copy this transmission. If this transmission was received in error, please immediately notify me by telephonedirectly at 651-736-3369 or 651-733-1500, and we will arrange for its return at no cost to you.

PAGE 1/3 * RCVD AT 1/12/2006 4:17:01 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/35 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:651 736 4517

* DURATION (mm-ss):01-06

32692

Customer Number

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Patent Case No.: 59417US002

JAN 1 2 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor:

OUDERKIRK, ANDREW J.

Application No.:

10/727026

ЗМ

Group Art Unit:

2879

Filed:

December 2, 2003

Examiner:

Quarterman, Kevin J.

Title:

PHOSPHOR BASED LIGHT SOURCE HAVING A NON-PLANAR LONG PASS

REPLECTOR AND METHOD OF MAKING

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR § 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope uddressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at 571-273-8300.

awrard 17 3000

Dear Sir:

Introduction

This is in response to the Office communication dated 12/12/2005. Claims 1-39 are pending. Claims 1-39 were restricted under 35 USC § 121 as follows:

- Į. Claims 1-33, said to be drawn to a light source, and said to be classified in class 313, subclass I13;
- Claims 34-39 said to be drawn to a method of manufacturing a light source, and said Π. to be classified in class 445, subclass 24.

Response - Election with Traverse

In response, Applicants elect Group I with traverse.

Traverse is made on the grounds set forth in the Official Gazette at 1184 OG 86 (Mar. 26, 1996), "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochial, In re Brouwer, and 35 USC §103(b)." In particular, rejoinder of the non-elected Group II claims is respectfully requested upon allowance of the elected Group I (light source) claims. Comparison

-1 of 2 -

Application No.: 10/727026

Case No.: 59417US002

of method claim 34 with light source claim 1 demonstrates the appropriateness of such rejoinder under the guidelines.

With all the recent attention on the large backlog of cases at the USPTO, it would sccm more important than ever to avoid unnecessary multiplication of patent applications resulting from overly aggressive restriction practice. Despite the fact that the Examiner has identified different classifications for the Group I and Group II claims, we submit that a substantial overlap in scarching and examination activities will be required, and that it would not be unduly burdensome for prosecution to proceed with both groups. On the other hand, forcing Applicants to file a divisional application directed to Group II would burden the patent system by adding another number to the backlog of US applications, and burden the present assignee by requiring payment of a separate filing fee for examination of the nonelected claims, as well as the added costs associated with prosecuting two applications and maintaining two patents.

Conclusion

Applicants have elected Group I with traverse. Continued prosecution of this application is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no fee is due; however, in the event a fee is required, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 13-3723. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the indicated telephone number with questions that can be resolved with a simple teleconference.

Respectfully submitted,

12 Jan 2006

Date

Stephen C. Jensen, Reg. No.: 35,207

Telephone No.: 651-736-3369

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel 3M Innovative Properties Company

Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833